



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/789,904

02/27/2004

Yuqun Chen

MS1-1969US

9299

22801 7590 05/05/2008  
LEE & HAYES PLLC  
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500  
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

HAUPT, KRISTY A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2876

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/05/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/789,904	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> KRISTY A. HAUPT	<b>Art Unit</b> 2876	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) KRISTY A. HAUPT (Examiner). (3) Beatrice L. Koempel-Thomas (Atty.).  
 (2) Jared Fureman (Primary Examiner). (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 29 April 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 8.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kaish et al. US 5,974,150.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner suggested the Applicant clarify the difference between the optical fibers cited in proposed amended claim 1 and the dicroic fibers cited in the prior art by the office. The Examiner also suggested Applicant clarify and possibly explain the dimension and coordinate limitations cited in proposed amended dependent claim 8.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Jared J. Fureman/  
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2876

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
 Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required